



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,066	07/31/2003	John Paul Dodson	AUS920030532US1	3527
35525 7590 01/04/2007 IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 01/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/631,066	Applicant(s) DODSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher A. Revak	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-20 recite of a computer readable medium that is directed toward non-statutory subject. According to the applicant's specification, beginning on page 17, line 33 through page 18, line 5, various examples of media is given, however transmission media is recited as a particular type of media that is non-statutory. The examiner notes that the applicant's specification is written in a manner which separates recordable media versus transmission media and the examiner suggests amending claim 15 to recite that the computer readable medium is either "recording medium" or a "storage medium".

As per claim 21, the claim recites of a computer program product which is not stored on a computer readable storage/recording medium. The claims are software alone, and of itself and should be amended to indicate that the computer program product is stored on "computer readable storage/recording medium."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2131

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5,6,12,13,19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Dependent claims 4,11 and 18 requires one of a **pass phrase** and a **digital certificate**. If a **digital certificate** is selected as per dependent claims 4,11 and 18, then dependent claims 5,12 and 19 is not further limiting since the **pass phrase** is determined to be valid and vice versa, if the **pass phrase** is selected in dependent claims 4,11 and 18, then dependent claims 6,13 and 20 is not further limiting since it is determined whether the **digital certificate** is from a trusted authority and if it is valid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5,7-12,14-19, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jin et al, U.S. Patent 6,311,275.

As per claim 1, Jin et al teaches of a method in a data processing system for providing addresses to clients, the method comprising receiving a request from a client for an address; determining whether authentication information is present in the request; performing an authentication process using the authentication information if the

authentication information is presenting the request; determining whether the authentication information is authenticated; and responsive to the authentication information being authenticated, providing a privileged address to the client (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 2, Jin et al discloses of further comprising responsive to the authentication information not being authenticated, providing a dummy (standard) address to the client (col. 5, lines 11-21).

As per claim 3, it is taught by Jin et al wherein the address is an Internet Protocol address (col. 5, lines 1-3).

As per claim 4, it is disclosed by Jin et al wherein the authentication information is a pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 5, Jin et al teaches wherein the authentication process determines whether the pass phrase is a valid pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 7, it is taught by Jin et al of a method in a data processing system for assigning addresses to clients, the method comprising: receiving a request from a client for an address; determining whether authentication information is present in the request; performing a verification process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; determining whether the authentication information is verified; responsive to the authentication information being verified, providing an address to the client; and responsive to the authentication information not being verified, denying the request (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 8, it is disclosed by Jin et al of a data processing system for providing addresses to clients, the data processing system comprising: receiving means for receiving a request from a client for an address; first determining means for determining whether authentication information is present in the request; performing means for performing an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; second determining means for determining whether the authentication information is authenticated; and providing means, responsive to the authentication information being authenticated, for providing a privileged address to the client (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 9, Jin et al teaches of further comprising providing means, responsive to the authentication information not being authenticated, for providing a standard address to the client (col. 5, lines 11-21).

As per claim 10, Jin et al discloses wherein the address is an Internet Protocol address (col. 5, lines 1-3).

As per claim 11, it is taught by Jin et al wherein the authentication information is a pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 12, it is disclosed by Jin et al wherein the authentication process determines whether the pass phrase is a valid pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 14, Jin et al discloses of a data processing system for assigning addresses to clients, the data processing system comprising receiving means for receiving a request from a client for an address; determining means for determining

whether authentication information is present in the request; performing means for performing an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; determining means for determining whether the authentication information is authenticated; providing means, responsive to the authentication information being authenticated, for providing an address to the client; and denying means, responsive to the authentication information not being authenticated, for denying the request (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 15, it is taught by Jin et al of a computer program product in a computer readable medium for providing addresses to clients, the computer program product comprising first instructions for receiving a request from a client for an address; second instructions for determining whether authentication information is present in the request; third instructions for performing an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; fourth instructions for determining whether the authentication information is authenticated; and fifth instructions, responsive to the authentication information being authenticated, for providing a privileged address to the client (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 16, it is disclosed by Jin et al of further comprising sixth instructions, responsive to the authentication information not being authenticated, for providing a dummy (standard) address to the client (col. 5, lines 11-21).

As per claim 17, Jin et al teaches wherein the address is an Internet Protocol address (col. 5, lines 1-3).

As per claim 18, Jin et al discloses wherein the authentication information is a pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 19, it is taught by Jin et al wherein the authentication process determines whether the pass phrase is a valid pass phrase (col. 4, lines 53-54).

As per claim 21, Jin et al teaches of a computer program product in a data processing system for assigning addresses to clients first instructions for receiving a request from a client for an address; second instructions for determining whether authentication information is present in the request; third instructions for performing an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; fourth instructions for determining whether the authentication information is authenticated; fifth instructions, responsive to the authentication information being authenticated, for providing an address to the client; and sixth instructions, responsive to the authentication information not being authenticated, for denying the request (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 22, Jin et al discloses of a data processing system for providing addresses to clients, the data processing system comprising a bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; a communications adaptor connected to the bus system; and a processor unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processor unit-executes the set of instructions to receive

Art Unit: 2131

a request from a client for an address; determine whether authentication information is present in the request; perform an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; determine whether the authentication information is authenticated; and provide a privileged address to the client in response to the authentication information being authenticated (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

As per claim 23, it is taught by Jin et al of a method in a data processing system for assigning addresses to clients, the data processing system comprising a bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; a communications adaptor connected to the bus system; and a processor unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processor unit executes the set of instructions to receive a request from a client for an address; determine whether authentication information is present in the request; perform an authentication process using the authentication information if the authentication information is presenting the request; determine whether the authentication information is authenticated; provide an address to the client in response to the authentication information being authenticated; and deny the request in response to the authentication information not being authenticated (col. 4, line 44 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, lines 22-24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2131

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6,13, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jin et al, U.S. Patent 6,311,275.

The teachings of Jin et al disclose of using password information in order to validate a user prior to assignment of a privileged address, however the teachings of Jin et al fail to disclose of using and validation of a digital certificate and which includes information indicating whether the certificate is from a trusted authority. The examiner hereby takes official notice that using and validation of a digital certificate and which includes information indicating whether the certificate is from a trusted authority is notoriously well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply the use of digital certificates as an alternative source of validation. It is notoriously well known that digital certificates are issued from trusted third parties wherein they can be validated and contain unique information as to who issued the certificate, the user it is assigned to, the user's public key, and validation periods that the certificate is valid for a certain length of time. It is obvious that the teachings of Jin et al could have been altered in order to include the use of digital certificates wherein the digital certificates would contain additional unique information that would more appropriately validate the user and issuer of the certificate.

Art Unit: 2131

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CR


December 28, 2006


CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER